



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

C. Warren, of Princeton University. The editors announce that beginning with January 15, there will be issued monthly a literary section devoted especially to reviews of the literature.

The British Journal of Psychology, edited by Professor James Ward and Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, of Cambridge University, with the co-operation of Messrs. W. McDougall, C. S. Myers, A. F. Shand, C. S. Sherrington and W. G. Smith. The first number will be published in January by the Cambridge University Press and the parts will thereafter be issued at irregular intervals, about 450 pages constituting a volume, the price of which is 15s. The following papers will appear in early numbers:

J. WARD: 'On the Definition of Psychology.'

C. S. SHERRINGTON: 'On the Interrelation between Corresponding Retinal Points.'

J. L. MCINTYRE: 'A Sixteenth Century Psychologist, Bernardino Telesio.'

W. McDOUGALL: 'The Sensations Excited by a Single Momentary Stimulation of the Eye.'

C. S. MYERS: 'The Taste-names of Primitive Peoples.'

R. LATTA: 'A Case of Recovery from Congenital Blindness.'

W. H. R. RIVERS: 'Observations on the Senses of the Todas.'

Also papers by F. W. MOTT, A. F. SHAND, H. HEAD and others.

The Proceedings of the Psychological Society will also be published in the Journal.

MR. F. SHILLINGTON SEALES will, from January next, edit in *Knowledge* the columns devoted to microscopy; still further space is to be given to this subject in our contemporary in the new year.

THE catalogue division of the Library of Congress has sent to press, and will issue shortly, through the office of card distribution, a set of analytics for Engler-Prantl's 'Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien.' Each article (family) in this important set of monographs will be represented by a separate catalogue card, which contains full bibliographical information, including exact dates of publication for undated signatures. Beside subject headings, all added entries will be printed in full. The cards covering the unfinished por-

tions of the work will be issued upon the completion of the volumes in question. The number of titles now going to press is 458, and the total number of cards necessary for main entries, subjects and added entries will be 936. These may be obtained at the office of card distribution. The task of analyzing this and other collective works of similar importance, titles of which will be announced later, has been performed by Mr. J. Christian Bay. Owing to the exacting demands of necessary work in other directions, the library has so far undertaken but little work of this character.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: As the St. Louis meeting of the American Association and its allied societies is drawing near, I beg the privilege of making, through the columns of SCIENCE, a suggestion to those, who I hope are many, intending to appear before Section B at that meeting. I think the general opinion of those who attended the Washington meetings of this section and of the Physical Society, which cooperated, is that the matter presented was, as a rule, very good, and that the manner of presentation was, as a rule, very bad. The habit of us physicists is to put in, before the meeting, a very modest claim for time, ten or fifteen minutes, when we have ample material for twenty or twenty-five, and then when we have the floor, to proceed as if we were giving a one-hour lecture in a course running through the year. Very few of our talks at society or association meetings give the impression of being thoroughly thought out, with a view not only to the subject, but to the audience as well. What we call 'papers' are apt to be rather disordered, imperfectly considered remarks about our papers, which in some cases are still to be written.

My suggestion is that every man who intends to make a communication to Section B at the coming meeting shall ask for as much time on the program as he is at all likely to need, and that, keeping his time allotment

strictly in view, he shall strive, days in advance, to put his matter into the most intelligible and attractive form. It should be remembered, too, that in the oral presentation of a subject before a friendly audience, it is better to give the hearers a chance to ask for more information, if they want it, or for fuller proof of statements made, if they think it needed, than to overwhelm and deaden them from the outset with a mass of details and an elaboration of argument.

EDWIN H. HALL,
Vice-president of Section B.

THE ST. LOUIS CONGRESS OF ARTS AND SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: By chance, I had at first overlooked Professor Dewey's reply, (SCIENCE, November 20) to my letter concerning the St. Louis Congress (SCIENCE, October 30). My answer thus comes late, but fortunately, the matter itself needs no further word, since all the questions involved, as far as they are of scientific import, were fully disposed of in my long letter. But Professor Dewey, in spite of the friendly tone of my answer, has now introduced in a most surprising manner a personal element, and that forces me to send a word of reply after all. He does not discuss the statements of my letter, by which practically all of his previous objections are proved futile, but he now turns the question so as to make it appear that I have made claims in my May article in the *Atlantic Monthly* which I had no right to make; he even ends with the climax that excuses are due from me to the editor and the readers of the *Atlantic*.

I had claimed in the *Atlantic* that the program of the congress adopted by the proper authorities involved a certain philosophical standpoint and a certain logical view of the sciences. When Professor Dewey expressed in his first remarks the idea that the program might exclude those who hold other views, I used the chief part of my reply to show that such a fear is unjustified. I showed that a man may have any views as to the logical relations of the sciences, and yet contribute in his special section with full freedom in spite of the framework of our program. It is

evident that my article and my letter harmonize perfectly. But Professor Dewey considers the fact that I did not speak of the philosophical bearing once more in my letter as a kind of confession that such bearing does not and probably never did exist.

I did not repeat my assertion because I had stated the case very fully in the *Atlantic*; but there was not the slightest reason to withdraw a single word. No one who understands anything of methodology can see the program without observing that it has a meaning as a whole only when certain philosophical views are accepted. In the meetings of the boards for final decision I explained the logical reasons for this specific classification fully, and, accustomed to the rhythmical attacks of Professor Dewey on my philosophy, I pointed out why a philosophy like his would appear to me an unsatisfactory basis for the work of the congress and why an idealistic program was essential. Perhaps I may add an external proof of the correctness of my assertions. When my exposition of the situation had appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, the director of the congresses asked me to allow it to be reprinted as a pamphlet for official distribution—in short, if Professor Dewey insists that apologies are due in connection with my *Atlantic Monthly* essay, it seems clear that they are not due to the editor and to the readers, but to the contributor. HUGO MÜNSTERBERG.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
December 3, 1903.

RIGHT-HANDEDNESS: A PRIMITIVE AUSTRALIAN THEORY.

THE attempts of primitive peoples to explain biological or physiological facts are not always of a purely mythic order. The blacks of the Tully River, North Queensland, Dr. Roth (*N. Queensl. Ethnogr. Bull.*, No. 5, 1903, p. 25) informs us, 'say, that at actual birth, according as the child presents its face to the left or to the right, so will it be left- or right-handed throughout life.' This seems a clear instance of aboriginal 'scientific' reasoning, and the theory deserves record at least in the history of the discussion of the question.

The blacks of the Pennefather River account